

REMARKS

Initially, Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesies extended in the recent telephonic discussion of this case. The amendments and remarks presented herein are generally consistent with those discussions. Accordingly, entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, mailed April 12, 2007, considered claims 1-11, 15-19, 24, 26, 28 and 30-33. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.¹ Claims 1-11, 15-19, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32 and 33 were rejected, and claim 31 was allowed. Claims 1, 6-11, 17-19, 24, 26-30, 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Strentzsch* (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,671). Claims 2-5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Strentzsch* in view of *Aziz* (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,234). Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Strentzsch* in view of *Onweller* (U.S. Patent No. 5,799,016).²

By this paper, claims 1, 24, 26, 31 and 33 have been amended, while no claims have been added or cancelled. Accordingly, following this paper, claims 1-11, 15-19, 24, 26, 28 and 30-33 remain pending, of which claims 1, 24, 26, 31 and 33 are the only independent claims at issue.

As previously discussed with the Examiner, Applicant's claims are generally related to resolving host names into corresponding host addresses, particularly where a native host name resolver is unable to communicate with a resolving computer system inasmuch as the host name resolver uses a protocol which is not accepted by a resolving computer system. For example, as recited in claim 1, a method for resolving host name data includes an act of assigning the requesting computer system as a name server for itself, in which the requesting computer system is a single physical device docked to a resolving computer system, and in which the act of assigning the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system a native host name resolver of the requesting computer system listing the requesting computer system as the only name server available for resolving host names. The native host resolver can

¹ Applicant respectfully submits that this claim is now moot inasmuch as the language cited by the Examiner as indefinite has been removed in the amended claims.

² Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

further request resolution of a host name by sending the data, in a first protocol, to itself. Monitoring of a name resolution port of the requesting computer system also occurs to determine when the requesting computer sends host name data in the first protocol to itself. The host name data in the first protocol is then re-rerouted to a replacement host name resolver in the same requesting computer system. Host name data is then sent from the replacement host name resolver according to a second protocol, and a resolved address is ultimately received at the native host name resolver of the requesting computer system, in which the resolving computer system forwards the host name data from the replacement host name resolver in the requesting computer system to a name server and the name server sends the resolved address while bypassing the resolving computer system.³

As discussed with the Examiner, while the cited *Strentzsch* reference generally relates to a system in which distributed clients can be coupled to various servers over a network such as the Internet. While generally relating such technology, however, Applicant respectfully submits that *Strentzsch* fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the present invention. For example, among other things, *Strentzsch* fails to teach or suggest a resolving computer system forwarding host name data from a replacement host name resolver to a name server, and the native host name resolver receiving the resolved address directly from the name server while bypassing the resolving computer system, as claimed in combination with the other claim elements.⁴ that within a requesting computer system, a native host name resolver lists the requesting computer system as the only name server available for resolving host names, or wherein the requesting computer system is docked to a resolving computer, as recited in combination with the other claim elements.

In particular, *Strentzsch* describes a system in which clients distributed throughout a system can be coupled to various servers over a network such as the Internet. (Col. 3, ll. 30-48). A user of the client system can provide a URL containing a host name, for which a browser attempts to identify a corresponding IP address. (Col. 4, ll. 47-52). To do so, the client extracts

³ The remaining independent claims generally correspond to the method of claim 1. In particular, independent claim 24 recites a similar method in functional (i.e., "step for") language. Independent claim 26 recites a computer program product encoded with instructions for performing the method of claim 1, and claim 31 recites a system having a processor and program modules that when executed by the processor cause the requesting computer to perform a method generally corresponding to claim 1. Claim 33 also recites a similar method in which a native resolver further maintains a list of addresses for resolution.

⁴ This element is cited by way of example only. Indeed, other elements are also not taught by the cited references and are not even asserted in the Office Action to be taught by the cited references.

the host name and sends a DNS query to a DNS server over the network connection between the DNS query and the client. (Col. 4, ll. 52-55). DNS servers maintain a mapping between host names and addresses. (Col. 4, ll. 59-60). An address may not be stored in the mapping inasmuch as "given the infinite number of host names, no one DNS server [] stores all mappings." (Col. 4, ll. 61-65). If an address is not located within the mapping on the DNS server, the DNS server forwards the request to additional DNS servers. (Col. 4, ll. 62-63).

Strentzsch further discloses that in some cases, a client sends DNS queries over the Internet which are received within a DNS proxy in a gateway server. (Col. 5, ll. 38-56). The DNS proxy of the gateway server maintains a local cache for temporarily storing some address-to-identifier mappings. (Col. 5, ll. 56-62). Thus, when a DNS query is received, if the information is in the cache, the DNS proxy can return the address to the client, thereby acting as a resolver. (Col. 6, ll. 11-14, 37-38). On the other hand, and inasmuch as no server can maintain all mappings, if the local cache does not have the mapping, the DNS proxy forwards the request to one or more other DNS servers over the Internet until a DNS server with the appropriate address-to-identifier mapping is located. (Col. 6, ll. 19-30). Thus, the DNS proxy sends out its own DNS queries over the Internet to one or more other DNS name servers. (Col. 6, ll. 39-41). Where the DNS server to which the request is forwarded uses a different protocol, the gateway, which acts as an interface between a client network and the Internet, can convert the request to any compatible protocol. (Col. 5, ll. 38-46).

While *Strentzsch* thus discloses a gateway server, acting through internal DNS proxy, which satisfies requests and forward DNS requests according to an appropriate protocol, it fails, as discussed with the Examiner, to teach or suggest a method, computer program product or system in which a resolving computer system forwards the host name data to a name server and such that the name server then sends a response which bypasses the resolving computer system, as claimed in combination with the other claim elements. Indeed, the Examiner appears to have acknowledged this deficiency inasmuch as the Examiner has allowed claim 31 and indicated that "the prior art fails to disclose 'where the resolving computer system forwards the host name data from the replacement host name resolver in the requesting computer system to a name server, and wherein receiving a resolved address at the native host name resolver of the requesting computer system corresponding to the host name data comprises receiving the resolved address directly from the name server by passing the resolving computer system.'" (Office Action, p. 14)

In view of the foregoing, and for the other reasons discussed in Applicant's last response and in the interviews with the Examiner, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 11th day of June, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
COLBY C. NUTTALL
Registration No. 58,146
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 047973

RDN:JCJ:CCN:gd
GD0000001912V001